



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,033	03/12/2004	Ivan W. Pulley	29795/10000A	6705
21912	7590	12/14/2007	EXAMINER	
VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP 10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200 CUPERTINO, CA 95014			LIN, KENNY S	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2152				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/14/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/799,033	PULLEYN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kenny Lin	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/9/2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-23,36-46 and 59-102 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-23,36-46 and 59-102 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 13-23, 36-46, 59-102 are presented for examination. Claims 1-12, 24-35 and 47-58 are canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/9/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 97-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The claimed limitation of claims 97-99 depend on the deleted limitations in claims 13, 36 and 59. Therefore, various terms used in claims 97-99 lack proper antecedence basis and render the claims indefinite. Furthermore, since the claims depend on deleted limitations, these claims

cannot further limit the invention since the structures and the relevance of the elements in claims 97-99 with claims 13, 36 and 59 are unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 13-18, 36-41, 59-64, 70-71, 74, 77, 79-80, 83, 86, 88-89, 92, 95 and 97-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema, WO 99/27680, in view of Wilson, US 7,127,471.

7. Huitema was cited in the previous office action.

8. As per claims 13, 36 and 59, Huitema taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method of providing an IP address for a host in a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

- a. A processor (computer is inherent to comprise processors) configured to: receiving, from a client in a computer network, at an appliance a request for an IP address associated with a domain name (page 1, lines 19-21, 26-40, page 2, lines 5-6; receiving at local server);

- b. Retrieving the requested IP address from a database associated with the appliance (page 1, lines 28-33, page 2, lines 5-11, 20; local cache);
- c. Transmitting the retrieved IP address to the client (page 2, lines 5-8).

9. Huitema did not specifically teach to that the database is object oriented database and domain name is associated with a zone wherein:

- a. The object oriented data base comprises a first zone object associated with the zone, wherein the first zone object is linked to a second zone object associated with a sub-zone of the zone; and
- b. The zone and sub-zone are associated with a logically hierarchical set of zone information.

10. Wilson taught to use object oriented database development to manage very large collections of information to represent the database as a collection of objects related by inheritance (col.2, lines 42-50) and a domain name hierarchy reflecting zone and associated sub-zone objects of a domain name (fig.4; col.7, lines 23-42). One would have been motivated to modify Huitema's database with an easier administering database similar to the object oriented database and management method taught by Wilson (see Wilson, col.1, lines 12-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema and Wilson because Wilson's teaching of domain name hierarchy using domain tree in object oriented database enables Huitema's method represent the namespaces of the domain name as a collection of objects related by inheritance.

11. As per claims 14, 37 and 60, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught the step of establishing communicative coupling between a client web browser and the appliance (page 1, lines 26-29).

12. As per claims 15-17, 38-40 and 61-63, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that wherein the computer network comprises the Internet, an IP based computer network and an intranet (300, fig.3, page 1, lines 19-21, page 4, lines 13-17).

13. As per claims 18, 41 and 64, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that the appliance receives the request (fig.1, page 1, lines 28-29, page 4, lines 13-19).

14. As per claims 70, 79 and 88, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Wilson further taught that the operating system is derived from a full operating system that includes the at least one software component (col.5, lines 45-47, col.6, lines 16-27).

15. As per claims 71, 80 and 89, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Wilson further taught that the at least

one software component includes one of the following: a driver or a utility software (col.12, lines 3-12).

16. As per claims 74, 83 and 92, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that the network name-related functionality comprises the DNS and the IP address comprises a requested IP address associated with a host identified in a DNS request received at the appliance (page 1, lines 24-40, page 2, lines 5-14).

17. As per claims 77, 86 and 95, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that the appliance includes a DNS server, a configuration server, a web server, a database, and/or a GUI (page 1, lines 24-40, page 2, lines 5-14).

18. As per claims 97-99, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Wilson further taught that the first IP sub-network and the second IP sub-network are included in a logically hierarchical set of IP sub-network information; and the object oriented database comprises a hierarchical structure associated with the logically hierarchical set of IP sub-network information (fig.4).

19. As per claims 100-102, Wilson and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Wilson further taught that the second network object is

a parent of the first network object in the hierarchical structure in the object-oriented database (fig.4).

20. Claims 19-23, 42-46 and 65-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Wilson as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of Frank et al (hereinafter Frank), US 6,832,120.

21. Frank was cited in the previous office action.

22. As per claims 19-23, 42-46 and 65-69, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach the system to further linking a host object with a network object and a zone object, the zone object is linked to another zone object, the network object is linked to another network object, unlinking an old network object from a host object; deleting the old network object; and linking the host object to a new network object and automatically updating the host object to reflect an association with the new network object. Frank taught that custom objects can be programmed and linked together to support applications (col.2, lines 6-15) and the links can be deleted, added or reconfigured in real time (col.5, lines 54-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Wilson and Frank because Frank's teaching of creating custom objects and linking objects enables Huitema and Wilson's system to use custom objects to support system applications.

23. Claims 72-73, 81-82 and 90-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Wilson as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of "Official Notice".

24. As per claims 72-73, 81-82 and 90-91, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach the appliance excludes a hardware component/communication port that typically is included in a host computing system but that is not required to provide the network name-related functionality. Official Notice is taken that the concept and advantage of eliminating or uninstalling unused hardware component on a computer is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema and Wilson and further assemble a host computer with only the needed components to reduce the cost of the system and further simplify the installations.

25. Claims 75-76, 84-85 and 93-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Wilson as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of Boden et al (hereinafter Boden), US 6,832,322.

26. Boden was cited in the previous office action.

27. As per claims 75, 84 and 93, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach to provide an interface for configuring the appliance. Boden taught to configure a DNS server system using a graphical user interface (col.7, lines 19-35, 43-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Wilson and Boden because the Boden's teachings of using graphical user interface for controlling and configuring the DNS server enables Huitema and Wilson's system to access and configure the remote DNS servers to avoid redundant copies of information contained (Boden, col.7, lines 19-20).

28. As per claims 76, 85 and 94, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught to user client web browser to send request to the appliance (page 1, lines 26-29). Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach to provide a web interface for configuring the appliance. Boden taught to configure a DNS server system using a graphical user interface (col.7, lines 19-35, 43-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Wilson and Boden because the Boden's teachings of using graphical user interface for controlling and configuring the DNS server enables Huitema and Wilson's system to access and configure the remote DNS servers to avoid redundant copies of information contained (Boden, col.7, lines 19-20).

29. Claims 78, 87 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Wilson as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of Belzile, US 6,801,952.

30. Belzile was cited in the previous office action.

31. As per claims 78, 87 and 96, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach that the database is an object oriented database. Belzile taught to store IP address in object oriented database (col.5, lines 32-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Wilson and Belzile and use an object oriented database as the database disclosed in Huitema and Wilson's system to store and retrieve IP address.

Response to Arguments

32. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13, 36 and 59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

33. Because Applicants have failed to challenge any of the Examiner's "Official Notices" stated in the previous office action in a proper and reasonable manner, they are now considered as admitted prior art. See MPEP 2144.03

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Low et al, US 6,131,095.

35. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

36. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl
December 11, 2007

